

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

James P. Moody, # 266364,)	C/A NO. 9:10-2451-CMC-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
South Carolina Department of Corrections;)	
Jon E. Ozmint, Director of SCDC, and)	
Captain Kenny Green, on day shift at Evans)	
Correctional Institution, in their individual)	
and in their official capacities,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, removed to this Court by Defendants.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On October 27, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this matter be dismissed with prejudice due to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court.

See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusion of the Report that this matter should be dismissed for failure to prosecute. However, because it appears that Plaintiff was released prior to the removal of this action, and never received the Order of Magistrate Judge Marchant directing that he keep the court advised in writing of any change of address, dismissal with prejudice is not warranted. It is difficult to comply with an order one never received. Therefore, this matter is dismissed without prejudice due to Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
November 22, 2010

C:\Documents and Settings\Guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesFFF692\10-2451 Moody v. SCDC dism wo prej failure to prosecute.wpd